UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,275	01/26/2001	Konstantinos I. Papathomas	EN995064BVUS4	7979

5409 7590 04/24/2002

ARLEN L. OLSEN
SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS
3 LEAR JET LANE
SUITE 201
LATHAM, NY 12110

EXAMINER
BERMAN, SUSAN W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1711	10

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/771,275	PAPATHOMAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan W Berman	1711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 April 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *13-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *13-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9 .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04-02-2002 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 01-08-2002 has been considered. The Japanese references that are lined through have not been considered because no Abstract nor translation has been provided. The documents have been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Specification

The amendment filed 01-04-2002 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the recitation in claim 23 "based on 100 parts of the cyanate ester". The Specification sets forth "based on 100 parts of resin". See page 24, lines 21-23.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christie et al (5,250,848) in view of Gelorme et al (5,464,726).

Christie et al disclose a method for encapsulating C4 connections and pin heads (column 7, lines 1-16). Solder interconnections are filled with a composition comprising a cycloaliphatic polyepoxide and/or a curable cyanate ester and a filler having a maximum particle size of 31 microns and cured by heating. Christie et al do not teach employing a photoinitiator, such as an onium salt, and photocuring.

Gelorme et al disclose compositions comprising a curable cyanate ester, a cationic photoinitiator, cycloaliphatic polyepoxide and a filler. Thus Gelorme et al teach that a cationic photoinitiator and photocuring can be employed to cure a composition analogous to the composition disclosed by Christie et al.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to employ a photoinitiator and photocuring in the compositions and method disclosed by Christie et al, as suggested by Gelorme et al in analogous art. The reason is that Christie et al and Gelorme et al disclose compositions comprising the same polymerizable components. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by a reasonable expectation that photocuring would provide the same product as heating since the polymerizable components are the same.

Claims 13-22 and 24-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christie et al (5,250,848) in view of Gaku et al (4,554,346).

Christie et al disclose a method for encapsulating C4 connections and pin heads (column 7, lines 1-16). Solder interconnections are filled with a composition comprising a cycloaliphatic polyepoxide

and/or a curable cyanate ester and a filler having a maximum particle size of 31 microns and cured by heating. Christie et al do not teach employing a photoinitiator, such as an onium salt, and photocuring in the disclosed method.

Gaku et al disclose curable resins comprising a cyanate ester compound, a hydroxy-functional ethylenically unsaturated compound and a photoinitiator that provide products having excellent heat resistance and electrical properties. Reinforcing agents and fillers taught by Gaku et al include epoxy resins, elastic rubbers, silica, alumina and boron nitride (columns 6-7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to employ a photoinitiator and photocuring in the compositions and method disclosed by Christie et al, as suggested by Gaku et al in analogous art. The reason is that Christie et al and Gaku et al disclose compositions comprising the same polymerizable components. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by a reasonable expectation that photocuring would provide the same product as heating since the polymerizable components are the same. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include the reinforcing agents and fillers taught by Gaku et al in the compositions disclosed by Christie et al in order to obtain the reinforcing and filler properties of these additives taught by Gaku et al. With respect to claim 17, It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to select diphenyliodonium initiator from those taught by Gaku et al because Gaku et al teach that any of the disclosed initiator/sensitizers can be used and because the compositions taught by Christie et al include epoxy compounds that are known to be photocurable in the presence of iodonium initiators.

Claims 13-16 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christie et al (5,250,848) in view of McCormick et al (5,744,557).

Christie et al disclose a method for encapsulating C4 connections and pin heads (column 7, lines 1-16). Solder interconnections are filled with a composition comprising a cycloaliphatic polyepoxide

and/or a curable cyanate ester and a filler having a maximum particle size of 31 microns and cured by heating. Christie et al do not teach employing a photoinitiator, such as an onium salt, and photocuring in the disclosed method.

McCormick et al teach cyanate ester/free radically polymerizable monomer adhesives for electronic adhesives. See column 19, line 611, to column 23, line 22. McCormick et al teach that the disclosed catalyst system of organometallic curative and free radical generators may be activated thermally or photochemically or by both methods in combination (column 6, lines 37-40, and column 20, lines 17-21). Other photoinitaitors are taught in column 11, lines 40-50.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to employ an organometallic catalyst system and photoinitiation, as taught by McCormick et al, in the compositions and method disclosed by Christie et al. The reason is that Christie et al and McCormick et al disclose compositions comprising the same cyanate ester and epoxy polymerizable components. McCormick et al teach that cyanate ester/epoxy compositions can be photocured and provide adhesives for electronic applications. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by a reasonable expectation that photocuring the cyanate ester compositions taught by Christie et al would provide the same product as heating since the polymerizable compositions taught by McCormick et al also comprise cyanate esters.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christie et al (5,250,848) in view each of Gelorme et al, Gaku et al and McCormick et al, as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Papathomas et al (5,194,930). Christie et al teach using silica filler optionally treated with a coupling agent. Papathomas et al disclose amino- and epoxy-functional silane coupling agents for treating high purity fused or amorphous silica in compositions analogous to those taught by Christie et al, Gelorme et al, Gaku et al and McCormick et al (column 10, lines 47-56). It would have been obvious to

one skilled in the art to employ the coupling agents taught by Papathomas et al as the coupling agent taught by Christie et al. The coupling agent taught in the prior art corresponds to the surface treating agents instantly disclosed, as is well known in the art.

Double Patenting

Claims 13-26 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,129,955 in view of Christie et al. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the comprising language of the claims of US '955 encompasses compositions including a cyanate ester, such as the cyanate esters disclosed in columns 11-12 of the patent. Christie et al teach, in analogous art, that compositions comprising a cycloalipahtic polyepoxide and/or cyanate ester or prepolymer thereof are useful for providing a solder interconnection. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a cyanate ester compound in the polyepoxide compositions used in the method claimed in US '955 and to photocure the compositions as set forth in the claims.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Berman whose telephone number is (703) 308-0040.

The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9310 or, for submissions after Final Rejection, (703) 872-9311.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist at telephone number (703) 308-0661.

Susan Berman

Susan Berman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1711

S B
4/20/02